LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U.S.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543

84-1597

Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 8 1985
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS
CLERK

No. A-612

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1984

STELLA E. MANN
PETITIONER PLAINTIFF

vs.

ISADORE SPIEGEL
RESPONDENT DEFENDANT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTORARI TO THE SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY APPELLATE DIVISION

STELLA E. MANN
ATTORNEY PRO SE
66 BROOKSIDE TERRACE
NORTH CALDWELL,
NEW JERSEY 07006
(201) 226-8766

EDITOR'S NOTE

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE POOR HARD COPY AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF AND WHEN A BETTER COPY CAN BE OBTAINED, A NEW FICHE WILL BE ISSUED.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Rules governing the Courts of the State of New Jersey and violated the Code of Judicial Conduct by concealing his conflict of interest?

2. Whether the Trial Judge should have disqualified himself under Rules 1:12-(f).?

3. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Rules governing the Court of the State of New Jersey and the Code of Judicial Conduct; Canon 2 by holding 2 trials at one time, one trial for the Record, and one trial "OFF THE RECORD"?

4. Whether the Trial Judge violated the First Amendment of the United States Constitution by threatening, intimidating, ordering and demanding "OFF THE RECORD" before the trial started, the areas he will not allow Plaintiff to discuss denying Plaintiff free speech and denying Plaintiff the right to point out Harold

R. Teltser, Esq., Defendant's attorney, as the mastermind in the Theft of her property? Did the Trial Judge violate the United States Constitution Amendment 1 by abridging freedom of speech of Plaintiff?

5. Whether the Trial Judge had a right to place a police woman to sit behind Plaintiff during the trial as a constant reminder to her that she will be held in Contempt of Court and arrested if Plaintiff violates the Trial Judge's demands? Did the Trial Judge who had a hot temper that he couldn't control carry his demands "OFF THE RECOR too far in violation of the United State Constitution Amendments 1, 5,9, 14, denying Plaintiff the right to a fair trial?

6. Whether Plaintiff had a right to mention Harold R. Teltser's, Esq., name during the trial, when Harold R.

Teltser, Esq., was using the unrecorded, fraudulent deed to her property to obtain money for Defendant for a period of 3 years before Plaintiff even knew she was a victim? The Trial Judge's denying Plaintiff free speech regarding Harold R. Teltser, Esq. denied Plaintiff justice and a fair trial.

7. Whether the Trial Judge violated the First Amendment by halting the trial repeatedly whenever Plaintiff mentioned Harold R. Teltser's, Esq. name or came close to mentioning his name? The Supreme Court can verify this "ON" and "OFF" record by reading the trial transcripts and taking notice at what point during Stella Mann's testimony the Trial Judge repeatedly halted the trial and went "OFF THE RECORD".

8. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Code of Judicial Conduct by allowing Defendant's attorney, Harold R. Teltser,

Esq. to steal Plaintiff's original handwriting exemplars before the trial started denying Plaintiff the right to use these original handwriting exemplars?

9. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Code of Judicial Conduct by allowing Defendant's Attorney, who repeatedly claimed he never had the original handwriting exemplars to return some of these original handwriting exemplars after the trial is over in front of the Trial Judge's eyes when it was too late for Plaintiff to use them.

10. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Code of Judicial Conduct by allowing Defendant's Attorney to obstruct justice by allowing Defendant's Attorney to steal handwriting exemplars in a Forgery Trial?

11. Whether it was improper for the Governor of the State of New Jersey to offer the Trial Judge a promotion

to the Appellate Division, when Defendant's Attorney was the Governor's law partner, business partner in land holdings, stock holdings and partnership in owning together Intercontinental Life Insurance Company and other business ventures and Defendant's Attorney was living in the Governor's private home?

12. Whether Defendant's Attorney, Harold R. Teltser, Esq. who lived in the Governor's home used the color of the Governor's office to deny Plaintiff a fair trial by offering promotions to those who must render a decision in this matter? FOR EXAMPLE - Harold R. Teltser, Esq., Defendant's Attorney offered John Nero a job of Alcoholic Beverage Commissioner for the entire State of New Jersey if he would vote in favor of his client who had a multi-million dollar contract with the State of New Jersey. Mr. Nero sat on a Public

Utility Commission which had a 2, 2, deadlock votes, he had the deciding vote. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. called him to his office to make this illegal offer, to put the fix in a decision. This case was reported in the news media about Harold R. Teltser's, Esq. bribe offer. When Plaintiff's property was stolen from her by the mastermind, Harold R. Teltser, Esq. he was using the Governor's private home as his base of influence peddling. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. was the SILENT GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY offering jobs and promotions in return for illegal decisions, etc.

13. Whether it was improper for the Governor of the State of New Jersey to use the color of his office to offer the Essex County Prosecutor a promotion to Judgeship, in return the Essex Country Prosecutor quashed Plaintiff Stella Mann's case that he was handling and

and did not obey Judge Morrison's order sending Defendant to the Grand Jury? Judge Morrison of Criminal Court went against the Trial Judge's decision. At the time the Prosecutor's office quashed the case the Prosecutor's office promised they were going to send the Fraud Deed to the N. J. State Police handwriting experts for a decision. But when the Governor of New Jersey offered the promotion, the case was quashed in the Prosecutor's office, and the person rendering a decision on the Fraud Deed instead of the N. J. State Police Handwriting Expert was also rewarded with a high state executive job for his decision.

14. Whether it was improper for Defendant's Attorney and the Governor of New Jersey both of whom formerly ran the Essex County Prosecutor's office as Prosecutor and Assistant Prosecutor

to use their influence to "quash" Stella Mann's case in the Prosecutor's office?

15. Whether Plaintiff should have had the right to delve into the SILENT FRAUD DEED RACKET that Harold R. Teltser, Esq. and his law partner, George Franconero, Esq., were operating out of the Governor's law office in which Harold R. Teltser, Esq. headed?

16. Whether the Trial Judge's violation of the First Amendment denied Plaintiff the right to delve into the Silent Fraud Deed Racket Harold R. Teltser, Esq. ran, in which not only Stella Mann's property was stolen out of Harold R. Teltser's law firm but 86-year-old Constance Lucille Smith's property was stolen by forgery? Harold R. Teltser's law partner, George Franconero, was convicted. Indictment #S.G.J.51·78.4. Inspection of this case and indictment reveals Plaintiff, Stella Mann, was a carbon

copy victim.

17. Whether the Trial Judge violated Plaintiff's Fifth Amendment Rights by losing his temper and at midtrial ordering Stella Mann can no longer go to her property, property she owned since 1971 to 1977 when the Fraud Deed was recorded?

18. Whether the Trial Judge also violated the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution by depriving Stella Mann, Plaintiff, of Life, Liberty and Property without due process of law.

19. Whether the Trial Judge also violated Stella Mann's, Plaintiff, Fourth Amendment rights having his court personnel physically abuse her, knocking her down to the floor, dragging her out of the courtroom restraining her and detaining her while the Trial Judge had her legal papers searched and seized without her present or any Attorney present to represent her.

20. Whether the Trial Judge abused

his discretion?

20. Whether the Trial Judge violated Stella Mann's Sixth Amendment Rights by placing on the stand Witnesses, Roger Sauer, Esq. and Barry Shapiro, and questioning them with Defendant's Attorney without Stella Mann present or any attorney present to represent her?

22. Whether Stella Mann was denied her Sixth Amendment right, and should she have been given the right to cross-examine these witnesses?

23. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Code of Judicial Conduct by placing in the trial decision false statements on the most vital points at issue? For example - The Fraud Deed reveals it was dated by the Notary on the 23rd and the witness on the 24th. The witness stated he doesn't recall changing the 24th to the 23rd. The Trial Judge in his decision says the witness struck over the 24th and made it a 23. The

witness never testified to that; the Trial Judge said that in his decision.

24. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Code of Judicial conduct by omitting Defendant's accountant's testimony in which he testified at trial that one month before Stella Mann's property was stolen from her, he prepared for Defendant a fraudulent financial statement showing Defendant already owned Stella Mann's property, before the crime of stealing her property had taken place.

25. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Code of Judicial Conduct by not sending the Deposition Books to the court above, in which the Notary to the Fraud Deed admitted under oath Stella Mann never came before him to notarize the legal document?

26. Whether the Trial Judge went against the weight of evidence in his decision when the witness to the Fraud Deed in a tape recording submitted at trial

admitted in the tape recording Stella Mann never came before him and the Notary to sign any legal document?

27. Whether the Trial Judge violated the Code of Judicial Conduct by allowing Defendant's Attorney to repeatedly violate the disciplinary rules of the Code of Professional Responsibilities?

28. Whether the Defendant's Attorney had the right to knowingly lie to the Court when the Court asked him a question why he didn't use in this Fraud Trial updated handwriting specimens of Stella Mann's signature. Defendant's attorney lied to the Court that he didn't have any, when in fact, he went on two occasions to Plaintiff Stella Mann's bank, received over 35 checks and signed a receipt for them and refused to use them at trial, but Defendant's Attorney lied to the Court to obtain a decision in favor of his client.

29. Whether Appellate Judge Pressler who rendered a decision in this case violated the Code of Judicial Conduct, when she told N. J. Senator Cardinelli who asked her about Plaintiff Stella Mann's case in which she recently rendered a decision against Stella Mann, Appellate Judge Pressler told the Senator she doesn't know anything about Stella Mann's case, and she told the Senator in that decision she went for a ride with the boys, meaning they made the decision and she went along with them.

30. Whether the New Jersey Court did an improper act by opening the Court Record Room on a weekend for Appellate Judge Pressler to obtain Stella Mann's case, which she already rendered a decision on so she can study it before appearing before the news media and a Senate Committee.

31. Did the Chief Justice of the Supreme

commit an improper act by meeting with Senator Orechio who was deeply involved in Stella Mann's case, when the Chief Justice had Stella Mann's case pending before him?

32. Did the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court have a right to protect Judge Pressler at a time Stella Mann's case was pending before him?

33. Whether Stella Mann can receive a fair hearing from the Supreme Court of New Jersey when 50% of the Justices were appointed by Governor Byrnes, who allowed Defendant's Attorney, Harold R. Teltser, Esq. to operate various rackets operate out of his private home, and the Governor allowed Harold R. Teltser, Esq. to use his private home as his base of influence peddling, and a base to offer state jobs?

Today, the New Jersey Courts are rigged with Governor Byrnes' appointments,

and whenever one of the Governor's boys gets into trouble Governor Byrnes writes to the Judge he appointed to the bench telling the Judge the person before him is a friend of his. This practice by the Former Governor should be halted, so that citizens of the United States can receive a fair and just trial.

I pray the United States Supreme Court as supervisor over the courts delve into this case, since I am up against heavyweights in the State of New Jersey who think they are above the law.

34. On February 22, 1980 it was reported by the Associated Press in all newspapers in the State of New Jersey the Federal Bureau of Investigation's "ABSCAM" agent wanted to pursue Governor Byrnes as a target in their undercover bribery inquiry, but they ran out of time. In the same report it says, "Byrnes'

former law partner, Harold R. Teltser, works for a trucking company "connected to organized crime. . ." The owner of that trucking company is Defendant Spiegel in this action who presently has Plaintiff's property in his name.

INDEX

	Page
Questions Presented	i
Opinion Below	1
Jurisdiction	4
Constitutional Provisions Involved ..	5
Statement of the Case	6
Reasons for Granting Writ:	
1. Trial Judge Violated First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Ninth And Fourteenth Amendments To The U. S. Constitution And Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 1, 2, 3, 5, 7. Defendents Attorney Violated Almost All of the Disciplinary Rules of the Code of Professional Responsibility Under Misconduct DR1-102 etc.	11
2. The Trial Court Judge and the Appellate Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey Has So Far Departed From The Accepted and Usual Course of Judicial Proceedings That The Supreme Court of the United States Power of Supervision Is Needed to Protect The Public From Judges Who Are Knowingly and Intentionally Violating The Code of Judicicial Conduct.	12
3. Documental Proof of Forgery And A Gross Miscarriage of Justice...	32
Conclusion	35

Appendix

Decision of Trial Judge Superior Court Of New Jersey Chancery Division, Essex County Docket # C-1100-7 Stella Mann Plaintiff, Isadore Spiegel Defendent, Decision Rendered April 25, 1979 ..... A-1

Decision of Newark Municipal Court Criminal Division, Newark, N.J. in the Matter of:
State of New Jersey v. Joel J. Nagel
Complaint #75374
State of New Jersey v. Anthony Iacaponi
Complaint #75375
State of New Jersey v. Isadore Spiegel
Complaint #75376
Decision Rendered Aug. 8, 1979 ... A-49

Opinion of Superior Court of New Jersey Appelate Division A-444-79 T2 Decided June 10, 1983 ..... A-58

Petition For Certification Supreme Court of New Jersey Docket #21,563 Denied Nov. 7, 1984 ..... A-62

CITATIONS AND AUTHORITIES

The Trial Judge Violated the Rules Governing the Court of The State of New Jersey.

Rule 1:12-(f) N. J. Court Rule Which States When A Judge Should Disqualify Himself.

The Trial Judge Violated The Judicial Conduct Canon 1, Canon 2, Canon 3, Canon 5 and Canon 7.

Violations of the United States Constitution:

Amendment 1 - Abridging the Freedom of Speech

Amendment 4 - Unreasonable Searches and Seizures

Amendment 5 - Deprived of Life, Liberty, Property, Without Due Process of Law .....

Amendment 6 - Confronted With Witness Against Him, Assistance Of Counsel

Amendment 9 - Rights Retained By People .....

Amendment 14 Section 1 - Deprive Any Person of Life, Liberty, Or Property, Without Due Process of Law .....

CITATIONS AND AUTHORITIES

VIOLATIONS BY DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY

HAROLD R. TELTSER

Disciplinary Rules of the Code of Professional Responsibilities of the American Bar Association. Harold R. Teltser Esq. Violated DR1-102 Misconduct,
DR 1-102 (A) (4)
DR 1-102 (A) (5)
DR 1-102 (A) (6)
DR 7-102 (A) (3)
DR 7-102 (A) (4)
DR 7-102 (A) (5)
DR 7-102 (A) (6)
DR 7-102 (A) (7)
DR 7-102 (A) (8)
DR 7-102 (B) (1)
DR 7-102 (B) (2)

RPC 3.4 FAIRNESS TO OPPOSING PARTY AND COUNSEL
RPC 3.5 IMPARTIALITY AND DECORUM OF THE TRIBUNAL
RPC 4.1 TRUTHFULNESS IN STATEMENTS TO OTHERS
RPC 4.3 DEAL WITH UNREPRESENTATED PERSON

Harold R. Teltser Esq. Conspired With Others To Violate United States Code Annotated Title 42 Chapter 21, Section 1985 of the Civil Rights Act-Conspiracy to Interfere With Civil Rights and Section 1983 Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights.

CITATIONS AND AUTHORITIES

VIOLATIONS BY DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY

HAROLD R. TELTSER

Harold R. Teltser Also Violated

NJS 2A: 131-4 False Swearing
NJS 2A: 98-1 (e) Conspiracy
NJS 2A: 98-1 (h) Conspiracy
NJS 2A: 111-1 Fraud and Cheats

United States Code Annotated Title 42
Section 1985 Conspiracy to Interfere
With Civil Rights.

I Strongly Suggest The Supreme Court
Obtain This Case Tried Before Judge
Egan of Morristown. Harold R. Teltser's
Law Partners Conviction Indictment
#S. G. J. 51·78·4

The Case Is Not Reported In The Law
Book's Because He Was Murdered.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1984

Stella E. Mann
Petitioner Plaintiff

vs.

Isadore Spiegel
Respondent Defendant

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY APPELLATE DIVISION

PRAYER

To the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States of America

Petitioner, Stella E. Mann respectfully prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgement and opinion of the Superior Court of New Jersey Appellate Division entered in this proceeding on June 10, 1983.

OPINION BELOW

The trial court rendered its decision on

April 25, 1979. The decision said Stella Mann sold her $600,000 property for $1.00 (One Dollar) to Defendant. A copy of the decision is attached as Appendix pages A1 to A48.

The Newark Municipal Criminal Court rendered its decision on August 8, 1979. This court found Defendant and those that aided him committed a fraud on Stella Mann and they were ordered to the Grand Jury to stand trial for fraud. A copy of the decision is attached as Appendix pages A49 to A57.

The Superior Court Appellate Division rendered its opinion on June 10, 1983. A copy of the opinion is attached as Appendix pages A58 to A61. The Appellate Division upheld the Trial Court Judge's decision.

Petition for Certification to the Supreme Court was denied November 7, 1984. A copy of the decision is attached Appendix page A62.

Application for extention of time in which to file Petition for Writ of Certiorari in

this matter was approved by Justice Brennan extending time to file to April 8, 1985.

JURISDICTION

The petition for certification to the Supreme Court of New Jersey was denied on November 7, 1984. On February 6, 1985 application for extention of time of 60 days to file petition for writ of certiorari was granted by Justice Brennan extending time to file to and including April 8, 1985. This petition for certiorari was filed timely. 90 days plus 60 days granted due to serious illness.

The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under Title 28, United States Code, Section 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

United States Constitution, Amendment I

Abridging the freedom of speech.....

United States Constitution, Amendment 4

Unreasonable searches and seizures....

United States Constitution, Amendment 5

Deprived of life, liberty, property, without due process of law.....

United States Constitution, Amendment 6

Confronted with witness against him, assistance of counsel.....

United States Constitution, Amendment 9

Rights retained by people.....

United States Constitution, Amendment 14 Section 1

Deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law.....

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On April 25, 1979 the trial court rendered its decision against plaintiff taking away from her the property she owned since 1971. The trial judge's decision was that he finds Plaintiff sold her $600,000.00 property to defendant for $1.00. The trial judge in his decision claimed Plaintiff Stella Mann signed the deed.

On July 30, 1979 the Trial Judge held a special hearing because plaintiff brought to his attention that defendant's attorney had stolen her original handwriting exemplars before trial denying her the use of these exhibits during the trial. Defendant's attorney repeatedly denied he ever received them from her attorney before trial. Plaintiff's attorney never told her the true reason why he couldn't use these exhibits at trial and concealed from her the fact that defendant's

attorney had them and refused to return them. On July 30, 1979 defendant's attorney revealed he had obstructed justice by starting to return a few of the original exhibits before the trial judge. For defendant's attorney to return examplars after the trial was over after he repeatedly denied he ever had them was a miscarriage of justice.

On Aug. 17, 1979 Plaintiff Stella Mann made a Motion to the Trial Judge to vacate his judgement on the grounds that he had a conflict of interest, the law firm that represented defendant had obstructed justice by stealing her exemplars before trial and many other serious violations including new evidence. The trial judge refused to vacate judgement.

Plaintiff Stella Mann after losing her civil remedy instituted a criminal

remedy pro se. A hearing was held in Newark Municipal Criminal Court and defendant was represented by Harold R. Teltser Esq. After many hearings the court rendered its decision on August 8, 1979. The court found defendant and those that aided him committed a fraud on Plaintiff Stella Mann and they were ordered to the Grand Jury to stand Trial for Fraud. Prosecutor Colburn was offered a promotion to judgeship which he accepted and he ordered this case quashed.

Plaintiff then appealed to the Superior Court Appellate Division and the Appellate Division upheld the trial judge's decision on June 10, 1983 . Judge Pressler, one of the three judges who rendered an opinion told New Jersey State Senator Cardinelli that she had gone for a ride with the boys, in plaintiff's case.

Senator Cardinelli spoke with her shortly after she had rendered her decision and Judge Pressler did not know what Plaintiff's case was about.

Judge Pressler had the Court's open e record room on a Sunday so she could get plaintiff's case to study before she appeared before the Senate Judiciary committee and the T. V. Cameras. This studying up of Plaintiff's case should have been done before she made a decision, but instead it was easier to go along for the ride with the boys. Appellate Judge Pressler was sworn in under oath before the Senate Judiciary Committee which questioned her about plaintiff's case that came before her. Judge Pressler lied to the committee when she told the committee Stella Mann's case was held to the very end to give her plenty of time to present her arguments.

The Court records will reveal this statement made by Judge Pressler was false and plaintiff's case was #3 on the calendar.

Plaintiff filed Petition for Certification to the Supreme Court. Her Petition was denied on Nov. 7, 1984.

Application for extension of time in which to file Petition for Writ of Certiorari in this matter was approved by Justice Brennan extending time to file to April 8, 1985.

REASON FOR GRANTING WRIT

1. THE MAJOR REASON THE SUPREME COURT SHOULD GRANT PLAINTIFF THE WRIT IS THE TRIAL JUDGE VIOLATED FIRST, FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH, NINTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

The Trial Judge violated the Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 1,2, 3,5,7. Defendant's attorney violated almost all of the Disciplinary Rules of the Code of Professional Responsibility under DR-1-102 Misconduct. Defendant's attorney violated Section 1985 Conspiracy to interfere with Plaintiff's Civil Rights.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

2 THE TRIAL COURT JUDGE AND THE APPELL-DIVISION OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY HAS SO FAR DEPARTED FROM THE ACCEPTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS THAT THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES POWER OF SUPERVISION IS NEEDED TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC FROM JUDGES WHO ARE KNOWINGLY AND INTENTIONALLY VIOLATING THE CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT, AND WHO ARE KNOWINGLY VIOLATING PLAINTIFF STELLA MANN'S RIGHTS GUARANTEED HER UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUITON. REQUEST HAS BEEN MADE TO THE NEW JERSEY SUPREME COURT FOR ITS POWER OF SUPERVISION IN THIS MATTER, BUT THE REQUEST HAS BEEN DENIED. THE TRIAL COURT, APPELLATE COURT AND SUPREME COURT HAS CLOSED ITS EYES TO DEFENDANT'S

ATTORNEY REPEATED OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IN THIS CASE BECAUSE DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY HAROLD R. TELTSER, ESQ. IS THE GOVERNOR'S LAW PARTNER AND LIVED IN THE GOVERNOR'S HOME AND USED THE GOVERNOR'S HOME AS HIS BASE OF INFLUENCE PEDDLING AND HE HAS COMMITTED CRIMES AGAINST PLAINTIFF, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AND AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

This is a case in which the "FIX was IN". This is a case of SILENT DEED FORGERY a RACKET being operated out of Governor Bynes law firm headed by defendant's attorney Harold R. Teltser, Esq. The governor's law partners in and around the year 1974 were running a racket of stealing properties from the sick and aged. The N. J. Prosecutor's office closed its eyes to this racket because

the Governor and Harold R. Teltser Esq. previously ran the Essex County Prosecutor's Office as Prosecutor and Assistant Prosecutor. The Prosecutor's Office informed me I was up against heavy weights.

In 1974 Stella E. Mann Plaintiff and Constance Lucille Smith became victims of SILENT DEED FORGERY in which both of their properties were stolen from them out of the Governor's law firm headed by Harold R. Teltser, Esq. This SILENT FRAUD RACKET was very sophisticated because it was being run by the Governor's law partners Harold R. Teltser, Esq. and George Franconero, Esq., both of whom are educated men and officers of the court by reason of their license to practice law. Harold R. Teltser's law partner George Franconero, Esq. was convicted by

a jury for stealing 86 year old Constance Lucille Smith's property. The trial was held before Judge Egan of Morristown, N. J. Indictment No. S. G. J. 51·78·4. Inspection of this trial transcript reveals Plaintff's was a carbon copy victim out of the Governor's law firm headed by Harold R. Teltser Esq. who personally masterminded the theft of Plaintiff's property for defendant. Harold R. Teltser Esq. was also the Governor's business partner in which they owned land, stock, insurance company (INTERNATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.) that was in the news media for ripping off aged policy holders. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. defendant's attorney used the color of the Governor's office to deny Plaintiff a fair trial by having the Governor offer promotions and jobs to anyone who would help Harold

R. Teltser, Esq. deny Stella Mann a fair trial. This is in violation of the United States Constitution. The Trial Judge was offered a promotion to the Appellate Division. The Essex County Prosecutor was also offered a promotion to Judgeship which he accepted. The prosecutor immediatedly quashed Judge Chester A. Morrison's decision of August 8, 1979. Judge Morrison ordered the defendant Spiegel and those who aided him be sent to the grand jury for stealing Stella Mann's property. Judge Morrison found probable cause they had committed a fraud on Stella Mann. When the prosecutor received his promotion to Judgeship he quashed the following Complaint Numbers Judge Morrison sent to the Grand Jury. IN THE MATTER OF: STATE OF NEW JERSEY VS. JOEL J. NAGEL Complaint Number

75376. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. informed Judge Morrison on August 8, 1979 that he made a decision that is directly opposite of Trial Judge Dwyer's decision. Judge Morrison informed Harold R. Teltser, Esq. I don't care about Judge Dwyer's decision I make my own decision and I find they committed a fraud on Stella Mann. Not only the judge and the prosecutor in my case were offered promotions even witnesses were offered jobs that only a Governor can appoint. Jack Schwartz a witness for defendant accepted the appointment to a state job that needed N. J. Senate confirmation. This appointment was made by Harold R. Teltser, Esq. Defendant's attorney. The Governor did not even know Jack Schwartz.

Before Plaintiff Stella Mann's

trial started, the trial judge departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings and placed rules on how he will try plaintiff Stella Mann's case. The trial judge's rules made before trial violated the United States Constitution First Amendment. The trial judge ordered he will not allow plaintiff Stella Mann to discuss Harold R. Teltser, Esq. (who masterminded the theft of her property for defendant) and informed her he would hold her in contempt of court if she violates his order. The trial judge had a serious conflict of interest with defendant Harold R. Teltser, Esq. His conflict of interest came about due to the trial judges' friends Pat Kramer and William Garner who got the trial judge appointed to the bench while they

were in Trenton and Pat Kramer was a member of the Governor's Cabinet. The Trial Judges' friends were wheeling and dealing with Harold R. Teltser's law firm in the area of preferential treatment and dirty state money. This is documented in the New Jersey Monthly Magazine Dec. 1979 issue in a lengthy article entitled WHO LET THE MOB INTO THE NEW JERSEY STATE TREASURY. The Trial Judge wanted to conceal his friends wheeling and dealing with the Teltser's law firm because during this period of wheeling and dealing with Harold R. Teltser's law firm, he, Arthur Dwyer the Trial Judge in this case was watching the store for his friends as acting mayor of Paterson, New Jersey. Arthur Dwyer was the legal adviser to Pat

Kramer, his close friend and was Secretary Treasurer for Pat Kramer's first campaign for Mayor of Paterson. Dwyer, Kramer and Garner socialized and played golf together. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. and his law firm and law partner George Franconero wheeled and dealed with the Trial Judges' closest friends in the area of preferential treatment and dirty state money. The Trial Judge tried to conceal this fact. In trying to conceal this fact he violated repeatedly the U. S. Constitution denying Plaintiff free speech. Since Harold R. Teltser, Esq. masterminded for defendant the theft of Plaintiff's property this denial of free speech in the most vital area of Plaintiff's case violated the First Amendment of the U. S. Constitution. The Trial Judge denying Plaintiff free

speech regarding Harold R. Teltser, Esq. purpose was to conceal his conflict of interest and to conceal his friends dealing with the Teltser's law firm. The Trial Judges' friends gave over $100,000.00 of state money to Harold R. Teltser's bag man George Franconero his law partner. Judge Dwyer's friends who gave this state money came back to Teltser's law firm with his hand out looking for a piece of the action back. Trial Judge Arthur Dwyer's friend got a piece of the action when he ended up with the business he gave Urban Loan Authority money for as Executive Director over the Urban Loan Authority of New Jersey. The Trial Judge would not allow Plaintiff to go anywhere near the name of Harold R. Teltser, Esq. during the trial because for Plaintiff to go near

that name would be too close to his conflict of interest. The Trial Judge departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings by holding two trials at the same time. One trial was FOR THE RECORD to deceive anyone who reads the court transcripts. At the same time parts of the same trial was held OFF THE RECORD for his hot tempered comments, demands, threats, intimidations and repeated violations of Plaintiffs rights guaranteed Plaintiff by the U. S. Constitution.

As the Trial went on the Trial Judge's temper off the record came to a point that he couldn't control it and he violated the Fifth Amendment of the U. S. Constitution by ordering at mid trial Plaintiff could no longer go to Plaintiff's property that Plaintiff had owned since 1971

to 1977, depriving Plaintiff of Life, Liberty or Property without due process of law. The Trial Judge violated Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment rights having his court personel restrain Plaintiff, detain and physically abuse Plaintiff and have his attendants physically knock Plaintiff down and drag Plaintiff out of the courtroom while the Trial Judge had Plaintiff legal papers searched and seized without Plaintiff present in the courtroom or any attorney present to represent Plaintiff during the search and seizure of Plaintiff's legal papers. The Trial Judge violated Plaintiff's Sixth Amendment rights by placing on the stand Roger Sauer, Esq. and Barry Shapiro, Esq. without Plaintiff present or any attorney present to represent Plaintiff, denying

Plaintiff the equal right given Defendant's attorney to question these witnesses. For the Trial Judge and defendant's attorney to question these witnesses without Plaintiff present or counsel to represent Plaintiff present, violated the Sixth Amendment Section I in which Plaintiff was deprived of Life, Liberty or property without due process of law and denied equal protection of the law.

The Trial transcript books will reveal that the Trial Judge held two trials at one time, one FOR THE RECORD and one OFF THE RECORD. When the Supreme Court of the United States reads Stella Mann's Trial Testimony it will reveal every time Stella Mann got close to mentioning Harold R. Teltser, Esq. name who masterminded the theft of her property

and whose law firm had a conflict of interest with the Trial Judge, the Trial Judge immediately halted the testimony and stopped the record. This was repeatedly done by the Trial Judge everytime Stella Mann got close to the Trial Judge's conflict of interest. The Trial Judge lost his temper and placed a police women from the Sheriff's Department to sit behind Stella Mann and he threatened to hold her in contempt of court and lock her up. All of the Trial Judges' illegal tactics were done OFF THE RECORD.

Stella Mann is a sick person who underwent major surgery at Sloan Kettering Memorial Cancer Hospital. She has been a school teacher for the last 25 years. In her 25 years as a school teacher, not one parent ever made a complaint against her.

Before Trial Judge Dwyer she was treated like a common criminal with a police woman sitting behind her during the trial with threats over her head by the Trial Judge. As the trial dragged on there came a point in time that the Trial Judge allowed his court personnel to physically abuse her, knock her down to the floor, drag her out of the courtroom and send her home with black and blue marks. The Trial Judge lost his temper because she was getting too close to his conflict of interest.

The Trial Judge treated Harold R. Teltser, Esq. with silk gloves because he was the Govenor's law partner.

Harold R. Teltser, Esq. should be disbarred for stealing Plaintinff's

original handwriting exemplars before Trial to obstruct justice in Plaintiff's case. This obstruction of justice is documented in Transcript book July 30, 1979. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. should be disbarred for lying he never received "original handwriting exemplar" when in fact he did. Proof that he did obstruct justice is documented in Transcript book July 30,1979. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. should be disbarred for masterminding the theft of Plaintiff Stella Mann's property for defendant Spiegel.

Harold R. Teltser, Esq. should be disbarred for running a SILENT DEED FRAUD RACKET out of his law firm with his law partner George Franconero. The Supreme Court of the U. S. should look into the SILENT DEED FRAUD RACKET being operated

by officers of the Court. At the George Franconero Trial the State Witness testified under oath that Harold R. Teltser Esq. was the man with the bank connections and there were 26 more potential victims being set up to have their properties swindled from them by SILENT DEED FORGERY. Lawyers for this racket were using geneology studies on the potential victims to see if they are sick aged and have no heirs. This racket in which Plaintiff became one of its victims was operated out of Harold R. Teltser's law firm and Harold R. Teltser's personally masterminded the theft of Plaintiff's property for defendant Spiegel.

Harold R. Teltser, Esq. had a complete disregard for truth and deliberately deceived the Court below. The Trial Judge asked Harold

R. Teltser, Esq. why he used old outdated writings, not signatures, that he pieced together. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. told the court he didn't have current signatures of Stella Mann and had to use what he had at hand. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. knowingly lied to the Court to obstruct justice. The truth was, on July 10, 1978 and on July 20, 1978 Harold R. Teltser, Esq. received from the Fidelity Union Trust Co., 765 Broad St. Newark, N. J. over 35 Plaintiff's checks, signature card, etc. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. did not use these at Trial and lied to the Court he did not have these when in fact, he did. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. signed his signature acknowledging receipt of 35 of Plaintiff's signatures from the bank. Harold

R. Teltser's an officer of the Court, has no conscience or integrity, he cheated and lied to the Court to render a decision favorable to his client. At deposition, Harold R. Teltser, Esq. admitted he handled the transaction for Defendant Spiegel to obtain money for him. Harold R. Teltser, Esq. in handling this transaction for Defendant Spiegel in 1974 was using the fraudulent unrecorded deed to Plaintiff Stella Mann's property claiming Defendant Spiegel owned Plaintiff's property when in fact he didn't. From 1974 to 1977 while Harold R. Teltser, Esq. was using Plaintiff Stella Mann's property to obtain money Plaintiff didn't even know her property had been stolen from her

because defendant and Harold R. Teltser, Esq. never recorded the fraud deed. Therefore, Harold R. Teltser, Esq. and defendant deceived Plaintiff by allowing the Tax Bills to stay on her name from 1971 through 1977 and allowed Plaintiff Stella Mann's name to stay in the deed book. When Plaintiff became ill and underwent major surgery at Sloan Kettering Memorial Cancer Hospital Harold R. Teltser and Defendant Spiegel recorded the fraudulent deed to Plaintiff Stella Mann's property. The Fraudulent deed when recorded states that Defendant Spiegel purchased plaintiff Stella Mann's $600,00.00 (Six Hundred Thousand Dollars) property for $1.00 (One Dollar).

REASON FOR GRANTING WRIT

3. Documented Proof of the Forgery and a gross miscarriage of justice. Another major reason why the Writ should be granted. The notary to the Fraud Deed admitted in the deposition book Plaintiff never appeared before him to sign any document. The Plaintiff called the witness at his home on the telephone and taped him. The Witness admitted in the tape recording, Plaintiff never appeared before him and the notary to notarize any document. On the tape recording the Witness whose name appears on the Fraudulent Deed volunteered and said the document is not legal. Defendant's Accountant testified at Trial he prepared a financial statement one month before Plaintiff's property was stolen from her and in

this financial statement he had already stated the property was owned by defendant. One month after this fraudulent financial statement was prepared Plaintiff's property was stolen from her by a fraudulent deed. This testimony under oath before Trial Judge Dwyer revealed Plaintiff was being set up to be swindled at least one month before the swindle occurred. The Trial Judge dishonesty has caused Plaintiff large sums of money and her health and the Trial Judge should be called before the Supreme Court for his dishonesty. Plaintiff is not the first female who came before Trial Judge Dwyer who took her property away. He also took the property away from Maria Minuskin. OFF THE RECORD in her case a news reporter

was in the Courtroom who heard Trial Judge Dwyer state we need sharks to eat up victims, as documented in the Newark Star Ledger.

CONCLUSION

The Petitioner Stella E. Mann prays that this Court grant a writ of certiorari to review the decision of the Superior Court of New Jersey Appellate Division. I respectfully request the United States Supreme Court under Rule 8 consider suspending Harold R. Teltser, Esq. from practice before your Court due to his conduct unbecoming a member of the Bar.

My property was stolen because in New Jersey there is no time limit to record a deed. There should be in the United States a uniform law as to when deeds to properties must be recorded. In the State of New Jersey a deed does not have to be recorded in 5, 10, 50 or more years. No questions asked, no late fee, making New Jersey the Silent Fraud Deed State. Our sister state New York requires a deed must be filed timely, if not filed timely, a late fee and penalty is charged every month the deed is not recorded and a special form is required

to be filled out with reason for filing late. Whereas in the State of New Jersey when a deed is filed late no questions are asked, no late fees or penalties are charged, no forms are required to be filled out stating the reason for filing late even if the deed is 25 years or more late in filing and recording making New Jersey a Silent Deed Fraud State.

I, Stella E. Mann do solemnly swear that as Attorney Pro Se I will ocnduct myself uprightly and according to law, and that I will support the Constitution of the United States. I request permission to be permitted to present oral argument before your Court in this case. I have been a school teacher for 25 years.

Respectfully submitted,

Stella E. Mann
Attorney Pro Se
66 Brookside Terrace
North Caldwell, NJ 07006

Appendix

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY

ESSEX COUNTY - LAW DIVISION

Docket No. C-1100-7

STELLA MANN,

Plaintiff

vs.

ISADORE SPIEGEL,

Defendant

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF DECISION

Date: April 25, 1979

BEFORE:THE HONORABLE ARTHUR C.DWYER,J.S.C.

APPEARANCES

MESSRS.SILLS,BECK,CUMMIS,RADIN &

TISCHMAN,P.A.

BY: LEE ADLERSTEIN,Esq.,

Attorneys for Plaintiff

OFFICE OF HAROLD L. TELTSER, ESQUIRE

BY: HAROLD L. TELTSER, ESQUIRE

Attorney for Defendant.

April 24, 1979

THE COURT: The Court would like to observe that this case does not involve the problems that are reflected in such decisions as Walker v. Walker,370 Michigan,332, 47 N.W. 2nd, 633. 31 ALR 2nd,1250 and the annotation beginning at 1255.

The recent case in the Eastern Seaboard pertaining to some of those problems is the decision of the Supreme Court, Pennsylvania in 333 2nd, 861.

Masaggi v. Massaggi, 1975.

In terms of the current press, that's the Marvin v. Marvin situation. Here, there is no ceremonial marriage and basically the issue one involving property rights in 6-8 Watchung Road in Millburn, New Jersey. That section of it that is referred to as Short Hills.

Growing out of a deed given by defendant, Isadore Spiegel, to the plaintiff, Stella Mann, on October 14th, 1971, creating an estate which had been in Isadore Spiegel in fee simple and himself outright a joint tenancy with the right of survivorship.

Plaintiff, Stella Mann, and I note that the pleadings of Stella Mann brings this action to have declared a subsequent deed allegdly from her back to Isadore Spiegel, dated January 23rd, 1974, and recorded sometime in January of 1977, a forgery, and therefore void for consequential damages or punitive damages.

In the Second Count, for conversion of her interest in the property or for punitive damages, the defendant, in the answer, does not deny P-8, the deed of October 14th, 1971. The pleadings allude to promises of marriages, understanding concerning the marriage, and there is some testimony in the case about both subjects.

The defendant does state that he did plead that he never received consideration of Thirty-Three Thousand Five Hundred from the plaintiff Stella Mann. He pleads that the deed, or denies that the deed of January 23,'74 is a forgery and pleads that if that is not valid then the deed of October 14th, 1971 should be set aside as a result of fraud, misrepresentations, and what not.

The Court has simply stated that in the interest of trying to boil down even more succinctly than it had first attempted in drafting this decision so that the preliminary background of this matter that might be understood.

The Court, at pretrial, dismissed the First Count of the Counterclaim for malicious abuse of process as being premature under the recent decisions of the Appellate Division.

The Second Count, the Counterclaim, as to the deed of October 14th, 1971, be declared void. Although the evidence presented in this matter will appear in the record in a disjointed record. To accommodate experts, travel plans of certain of the witnesses and the health problems of defendant who had a doctor sit in the courtroom while he testified, and except for those times did not appear during the trial and it will also appear that it rambled fairly far and wide allegedly to cover grounds of credibility and on certain issues which in the final event will turn out not to be material.

The Court considers the issues in the following order. January 23rd, 1974 deed, a forgery. What claims, if any, this plaintiff has for the period October 14th, 1971 to January 23, 1974 if the deed is or is not a forgery.

First, the Court shall attempt to briefly outline the background of relations between plaintiff and defendant. Between 1950 and sometime in 1973, plaintiff lived at 225 Lyons Avenue in Newark with her parents and her brother, Marvin, hereinafter Marvin. Her mother did not work. The plaintiff worked at the General Electric in the early 50's and until 1958 when she graduated from Seton Hall.

She then began work for the Township of Union as an elementary teacher at the third grade level. Marvin worked for American Can in Hillside until 1966, when he was retired on disability with a monthly pension of Six Hundred and Forty Dollars, and later years, sometime in the 70's as the Court recalls it, the pension was increased somewhat, and I think there may have been a lump sum payment to him.

The family owned a house and the father worked until he became ill. The mother died of cancer in 1962. The father, for a number of years, received some payments under social security.

The defandant, in the 1950's and the early 1960's lived on Wainwright Street in Newark. He graduated from high school served in the United states Army, held various jobs in which he learned about trucks and rudiments about business.

In 1956, or thereabouts, he started his own trucking business by buying a truck.

The defendant has five married sisters and a widowed mother who now lives with him. She is 91 years of age.

The plaintiff and defendant first met on the beach in Asbury Park in the early 60's.

Thereafter they saw each other, accounts vary a little bit, but not significantly, and began to go out together as boy friend and girl friend about 1963.

There is substantial evidence that there was a friendly relationship between the two with periods of no contact from time to time.

There is evidence, and the Court finds that in the late 1960's and early 70's they looked at various houses with the thought of buying them. There is some evidence to indicate that the defendant was suggesting that they get married and they were looking at houses for that purpose. The plaintiff denies that, but there is no evidence that they were looking at those houses as speculative ventures to buy and resell.

Defendant assetrts the reason they never got married is the plaintiff could never make the decision. He says he proposed over two hundred times. She says he never proposed, never discussed marriage.

The Court finds that they did exchange expensive presents over the years. The Court finds that they did travel together, partcularly to resort areas in the Caribbean Las Vegas, Florida and Cape Cod.

This activity developed as defendant's business prospered. some of the trips were awards from manufacturers or sellers of appliances to heavy purchasers of appliances.

On occasions they traveled as Mr. and Mrs. Spiegel. Plaintiff was on a travel sabbatical from September,'71 to June, 1972, and she was on sick leave sabbatical from September, 1976 to June 1977, and from September,'77 as the Court recalls it, sometime in '78.

In respect to the subject premises, plaintiff contends that she spotted a picture to picture of it in the Newark News about October 5th of 1970, when it was burned out and called the picture to the defendant's attention. She further contends that he told her to get the address.
She states that she called his attention to the legal notices for a foreclosure sale. The evidence that would have been approximately a little less than a year later.

She testified that she like to buy at auctions. She testified that in 1963, either she or her brother bought two safe boxes, that were marked for identification, and photographs of which are in evidence, at a bankruptcysale. She testified that she owns eight automobiles, all bought at auctions. She testified she bought a house at 66 Brookside Terrace at an auction. I take it a foreclosure sale.

She testified that she and defendant discussed bidding at the sale of 6-8 Watchung Road, Short Hills, but he told her that they should not bid against one another. The Court does not find her version credible. She also testified that she did not understand about mortgages and let Izzy handle that. Defendant had begun to purchase the mortgages in default on the property. The documentation on that is in the record and it appears that was done early in the Summer of 1971.

He did not bid at the foreclosure, according to the testimony, but did take an assignment from the successful bidder and the deed from the Sheriff runs to him.

Plaintiff contends that she had an understanding with the defendant that they would buy the propertyb as a speculation, fix it up and sell it. She would pay one half of what he paid for it. She would contribute her brother-in-law, Milton Berkowitz' talents to supervise, particularly brick work, free of charge and brick work by him, free of charge and her own efforts free of charge. Defendant would pay one half of the purchase price and pay all other expenses and use the insurance proceeds of Ten Thousand Dollars to help defray the costs.

Defendant, on the other hand, said that he saw the property before the fire, he saw it sometime in the Summer of 1970. He produced several witnesses to corroborate this, including Benjamin H, Bendit, Esquire.The latter subsequently handled the purchase of the first mortgage for defendant in settlement of the payment of the insurance claims due the mortgagee. The latter were ultimately paid in January of 1972 to the defendant.

the Court finds that defendant knew the premises before plaintiff told him about it. The Court finds that plaintiff and defendant did duscuss a joint interest in the property before October 14th, 1971. there is a dispute as to whether they first discussed plaintiff to have a ten percent interest for Eight Thousand Dollars. Plaintiff contends that she did not learn of this later,. I believe in Florida when she found such a deed in the trunk of his car.

Defendant contends that about a week before October 14th, 1971, he told her that he would give her half if she married him, but wanted half its present value from her a as security in case she did not.

The Court finds that the testimony relating to marriage surrounding this is not relevant, cannot be utilized to vary the terms of the deed, P-8. It is clear from the testimony that there is not a sufficient basis to find plaintiff, Stella Mann, over the years had not indicated to him a reluctancer to get married, had not demonstrated on several occasions concern for quarters for herself and her brother and for others. The Court finds that part of the defendant's testimony to be credible, but also sufficient to destroy any claim for fraud because he well knew the behavior characteristics of the plaintiff and on his own version on several occasions prior to the fall of 1971 had experienced the same problem.

Defendant had Benjamin J. Weiss prepare a deed from her to her and him as joint tenants for the right of survivorship for a recited consideration of Thirty-Three Thousand Five Hundred Dollars,P-8. The defendant selected Benjamin J. Weiss.

However, the Court notes at this point that failure to receive the consideration is not barred by the Parole Evidence Rule, see 9 Wigmore, Evidence Section 2433. He denied ever receiving it. There, Wigmore points out that the recital is not an essential term of the deed but is no more than a mere receipt. It is nothing more than an admission against interest which one may demonstrate not to be the fact in the overall context.

She testified that on October 14th,1971, he picked her up at 255 Lyons Avenue Newark, standing in her kitchen she gave him Thirty-Three thousand, Five Hundred Dollars in cash from cash she and her brother,

kept in the basement normally, totalling between Forty to Fifty Thousand dollars. The Court notes that they recognized that this was an area in 1967 that had been the subject of much disturbance and that there has been much deterioration of the neighborhood since that time.

In the school year, 1970 to 1971, her highest salary was Thirteen Thousand Dollars,. She had started at Forty-Two Hundred Dollars in 1968. She and her brother contributed to the support of the house at 255 Lyons Avenue. Except for the death of an aunt in 1970 and moneys received from the estate of that aunt-- I really shouldn't seay from the estate of the aunt. From savings accounts that stood in the name of the aunt as trustee for Stella, Esther Stella or Marvin Mann or Dorothy Berkowitz or Mortimer Mann, the old New York Cotton Trust and certain bonds so stipulated.

This Court would find the account of Forty to Fifty Thousand Dollars cash in the basement very difficult to believe. The source of the earnings, the circumstances of the place and the fact that the plaintiff had two safe deposit boxes, had a checking account, had the earnings and the drain upon her earnings as well as those of her brother,that she did not accumulate that amount of money particularly where there is no inheritance from the parents and her siblings had conveyed their interest in the house, 255 Lyons Avenue to her more than amazing.

In 1971 and '72, she received sixty percent of her then Fourteen Thousand Five Hundred Dollars salary because she was on the travel sabbatical leave which would indicate that one was planning to travel which requires an expenditure of money.

From what the Court can decipher, she received Twenty-Nine Thousand Eight Hundred and Eighty Four Dollars and Seventy Cents, plus a check for Eight Thousand One Hundred Twenty-Nine Dollars and Two Cents made out to her sister, Dorothy Berkowitz, who is married to Milton Berkowitz.

Testimony is that this check was endorsed to the plaintiff, Stella Mann, because the Berkowitzes were indebted to her for moneys that Stella had advanced to them because of the illness and othere problems in their family. If that be so, it is possible that be so, it is possible that more than the Eight Thousand One Twenty-Nine had been advanced and makes it even more difficult to understand where this great acculumation of cash came from.

So far as the record shows, approximately two thousand of the approximate thirty-seven thousand plaintiff received may have been taken in cash. Of the Thirty-One Tjhousand Two Hundred Fifty-Nine Dollars and Ninety-Eight Cents that Marvin received, approximately fifteen thousand may have been taken in cash. the rest is reflected in deposits in the Howard Savings Bank accounts and Security National Savings accounts.

The plaintiff testified that she owned Eight Thousand Ddollars worth of stock, coins worth Ten Thousand Dollars and prior to October 14, 1971.

First, the fact that the sister endorsed the check, the Court has indicated, shows that there was a utilization of her resources prior to that time makes it questionable that the sum of Forty Thousand Dollars, Fifty Thousand Dollars was in the basement.

The only receipt that the plaintiff has for this large amount of cash is not even initialed on the envelopes in which this was stacked up, as I recall Marvin's testimony, at a thousand dollars to the envelope. There were no witnesses. Marvin was out.

Marvin testified that he checked a few days later and found that of the Forty-Two Thousand that had been there . after he had paid Four Thousand to the State of New York there was only Eight Thousand Five Hundred Dollars left.P-32, one of the Howard Savings accounts, show Ten Thousand Dollars in deposits were withdrawn between October 12, 1971 and January 26, 1972.P-34 shows that there were no withdrawls in that period. Again, this is the period of the travel sabbatical and the travel requires money.

Further, when plaintiff purchased 66 Brookside Terrace,m North Caldwell, in January, 1973 Six Thousand Dollars was withdrawn from D-38, the account in Security National Bank and there was also Twenty-Five Hundred Dollars withdrawn from D-35, that's the City Federal Savings account. There was Fourteen Thousand Dollars put down in cash, as I recall it, and a mortgage for Forty Thousand was obtained from the Howard.

Considering plaintiff's testimony and Marvin's testimony together, including the coins worth Ten Thousand, and eight cars, each at auction, the need to care for parents, assistance to other relatives, the payment of Fourteen Thousand Dollars cash, beginning in January, '73 when apparently Eight-Five Hundred Dollars came from savings accounts, the Court does not find credible the account of Forty to Fifty Thousand dollars cash pre the inheritance.

Nor does the Court find credible Marvin's account of taking Three Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-One Dollars and Twenty-Four Cents cash from the house the day he deposited a check for Eight Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty-One Dollars and Twenty-Four Cents.

He testified he knew he had to have at least the amount of the check he was going to cash on deposit. The deposit of Three Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty-One Dollars and Twenty-Four Cents brought the balance to Ten Thousand Three Hundred Eighteen Dollars and Thirty-One Cents. Maybe the Court is naive, the Court would not think that someone who was keeping envelopes with even units of a thousand ~~dand~~ dollars in the basement is going to come up with a sum of money of Three Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty-One Dollars and Twenty-Four Cents to round it off.

The same story was repeated in cashing the check from the United States for Fifteen Thousand One Hundred Sixty-Two Dollars, where he deposited Five Thousand One Hundred Sixty-Two Dollars on the same day he cashed that check. The balance afterwards was greater than the Fifteen Thousand One Hundred Sixty-Two.

The Court finds that he took Five Thousand cash from the first check and Ten Thousand from the second. The Court does not find plaintiff's statement that she paid Thirty-Three Thousand Five Hundred Dollars in the kitchen of 255 Lyons Avenue credible. The court does find that the defendant knowingly and voluntarily and with advice of counsel, of his own selection, executed P-8, the deed of October 14, 1971.

Shortly thereafter, the renovations of 6-8 Watchng Road began. The Court finds, because it is undisputed, that defendant paid all the taxes, the insurance and costs for material done on the property. In respect to one item for Twelve Ninety-Five for glass purchased, the plaintiff paid for that and the Court finds she was at least reimbursed for it. The Court finds that defendant selected all contractors.

The Court finds that when plaintiff and defendant were on speaking terms she did help select items. She did suggest colors, she did go to a number of places to look at various items and this Court has no doubt that she made suggestions to the defendant,. Isadore Spiegel, but even plaintiff admitted that when she ws out of the state during the year of travel sabbatical,

She was not in a position to do anything. Whether the disagreement between the plaintiff and defendant lasted from September, 1972, or December, 1972, until June, 1973, there is no dispute that while it lasted she did nothing in respect to 6-8Watchung Road.

In respect to Milton Berkowitz. The Court finds that he did do some work, but based upon the preponderance of the credible testimony, he did not supervise the job. There is credible testimony that defendant, Isadore Spiegel, knew Milton Berkowitz from having hired him to do work at his premises in Hudson County, I believe it's in Kearny, and that he also knew his two fellow masons.

By that, I mean bricklayers, not members of the Masonic Lodge. There is some evidence that all four gathers Thursday nights, at least for some brief period of time, at the Jewish War Veterans.

In any event, Milton Berkowitz did do work at 6-8 Watchung Road. The Court does not find that Milton Berkowitz was paid for all the work that he did but that he was paid at least for some if not all the work that he did. The Court finds it believable that Milton Berkowitz might have devoted and given to the plaintiff a small amount of his time free of charge, out of affection for her, where she had been advancing to his family funds to help them out in needy times, but finds that there would be little incentive to do that on a wholesale scale for Isadore Spiegel, for whom he regularly worked.

The court finds that in December, 1972, if not earlier, plaintiff and defendant were not speaking. Plaintiff refers to this as the Acapulco period when the defendant, Spiegel, with some other friends, acquired premises in Acapulco. It was not until they had resumed their conversations that she went to Acapulco with the defendant, but in December of 1972, defendant testified that he went to Benjamin Weiss to have a deed prepared for the property from the plaintiff back to him. The deed was prepard and was set up to be executed by Benjamin Weiss.

The Court finds that in June, 1973, plaintiff and defendant resumed their former friendly relationship. At the end of 1973, defendant was seriously considering the purchase of the Crucibel Steel Plant in Harrison,

consolidated his warehousing operations from Belleville and Secaucus. At the time, he owned property on Essex Street, I forget whether it was in Harrison or Kearny.

Exhibit D-20, and the Court notes that it does not accept that as a reflection of the value of the improvements added to the property, but as a totalling of money expended, the difference is this, one could spend Ten Thousand Dollars putting gold fixtures on the bath tubs and sinks in a house, but that would not necessarily raise the market value by Ten Thousand Dollars. The impact of the expenditure upon the value of the premises are two different things.

If I replace ordinary windows with Anderson windows I may have made a large expenditure but I will not increase the value of the property by the amount of the expenditure. A lot of the expenditures here could be questioned in terms of value. It also lists basically the Sixty-Two Thousand Dollars.

The accountant, I gather, wanted to list the house as an asset and relate the value of th asset somewhat to these expenditures. This sets the framework for the resolution of issue one.

Circumstances of execution. The deed bears a typed date of January 23, 1974 on the front.

Joel J. Nagle, who worked for Art Metal as traffic manager, I believe his plant is in Harrison across the old Clay Bridge, as traffic manager, signed as a witness on January 23, 1974 and also took the acknowledgement on that date as a notary public. A separate witness, Anthony M. Iacaponi, signed as a witness but struck over the 4 in 24 and made it 23.

Plaintiff produced P-4, her lesson plan book for the 1973-'74 school year to show that she attended a curriculum session on mathematics at the school in Union until 5 P.M. She testified that she then went back to her class room and then went home by way of the Parkway, stopping to buy a dollar's worth of gas on the Parkway before reaching her home in North Caldwell.

She testified that she never saw J-1 or a copy thereof until October 4, 1977, when inspired by intuition on a Tuesdday, she went to the Register of Deeds Office in the Hall of Records in Newark and found the deed from her to the defendant. The Court shall return to this.

The defendant testified that in 1972, as noted above, he had had the deed prepared. When he received it, he kept it in his files. Theree's no question they reconciled in June, 1973 when he went to the restaurant where she regularly ate breakfast. I think this testimony was she almost dropped her fork. Her account of the incident is not much different. Then they resumed their friendship.

Defendant testified that he started plans to buy the Crucibel Plant in Harrison late in 1973.

He told plaintiff about this, plaintiff testified that she knew of these plans. She thought he was going to sell the property at Essex Street, help finance it was part of her testimony. He wanted to bring together his operations from Bloomfield or Belleville and Secaucus to Harrison. The Crucibel Plant was a large building, over three hundred square feet. To swing the deal, a large mortgage would be necessary.

Defendant testified that he had to get his portfolio in order so as to be able to present a decent financial statement. Defendant testified that he asked plaintiff for the property back, property being 6-8 Watchung Road in Short Hills. She earlier, in 1973, had bought her own home in North Caldwell and retained title to the 255 Lyons avenue property in Newark.

Defendant testified that he asked plaintiff for the property back. He testified that he cried in fron of her for it. She agreed to give it to him.

Plaintiff, at one point, testified that if the defensdant had asked for a deed for the property she would have given it to him but he was not man enough to ask, he forged it. Defendant testified he arranged for Nagle to go to the house and for Iacaponi to go to the house. This meant Iacaponi had to detour from Bayonne and Nagle had to have his car, for he lives in Edison and sometimes comes by train.

He would need a car to get from Short Hills down to Edison.

Both the witnesses testified that they were told to be there after 5 P.M. and left after work and left for the house after work.

The witnesses testified that plaintiff and defendant were already at the premises when the witnesses arrived. Some form of table and chairs were used, the room was cold. I believe the defendant testified that there was a makeshift plywood table that the workmen were utilizing. There was little discussion. The document was signed, and after it was signed by Mann, Nagle, Iacaponi, it was given to the defendant. All testified that they saw the plaintiff sign.

In respect to the place for signing, plaintiff asked why 6-8 Watchung Road. Why not in the Lawyers office as when the deed had been executed? Union is the adjoining municipality to Millburn, in which Short Hills is located.

The probable reason was convenience to plaintiff so that wshe could stop there on the way home from school. Checking the Essex County and Union County maps, I understand that Washington School is just behind the Galloping Hill country Club, Golf Club. It does not appear that there would be a great distance, certainly not more than a twenty minute slow drive from the school to the house.

Significantly, all were told to be there after 5, unlike plaintiff's normal day where she would leave at three. Plaintiff was leaving after five because she had a meeting. This suggests an inference, at least, that the meeting had been arranged in advance and had been arranged for her convenience, so that she would not have to travel back to the offices of the attorneys.

The handwriting experts. Plaintiff called two and defendant one. Joseph McNally, who's had over thirty years experience in the New York Police Lab as a handwriting expert, focused on the difference between the signature on J-1, Stella Mann, and the signature Stella E. Mann upon P-1a and Pf, which are checks. He conceded there was a strong resemblance between P-2, Stella Mann, on the back of an envelope in J-1, he suggested resembled plans was so strong that P-2 might have been the basis for the copying he found on J-1. He noted the smudge on J-1 evidence abrasion, the squaring away of the B's of the signature line. He studied P-2, but not the other defense exhibits.

They did not change his opinion nor did Ordway Hilton's opinion change his opinion. He stated the defense exhibits were not contemporaneous with the period, 1974 when J-1 was executed.

Renee C. Martin has worked in the field for 25 years. She has written on personality analysis and the study of questioned documents. She studied P-1a to Pf and J-1. She noted some imperfections on J-1. She said that there was ink eradication on J-1 in front of the S in Stella. She drew differences on P-1a and Pf. These were valuable because they were contemporaneous with J=1. She compared D-2 and D-2´ and P-2 to each other and to P-1 as to P-1f, nbut did not compare them to J-1, at least, as the Court recollects the testimony.

These studies did not change her opinion that J-1 was not written by the author of P-1a and P-1f. P-2 was an envelope. therefore, it cannot be regarded as a signature, and it was done seven years earlier, difference in time. The signature was not spontaneous. P-2, D-2, the speed and the pressure are similar. There is little angularity to the top of the letters as are found in J-1. she also notes checks are a legal signature, a deed is a legal document and therefore would be appropriate for comparison. However, the names are different but her inference is that the names should be the same if they are not forgeries.

Ordway Hilton testified for the defendant. He graduated from Northwestern University in 1935, had a Masters in Mathematics about 1937.

Then he commenced work for the Chicago Police Department in its crime laboratory beginning with handwriting analysis. During the war he was in the United States Navy Intelligence and then joined an outfit in New York to study questioned documents.

He presently teaches each summer, summer school at Northwestern University as I recall it, for professors. He has authored the Scientific Examination of Questioned Documents, 1956 published by Callaghan and Company, currently that work is being revised.

In his opinion, plaintiff wrote J-1. He stated that the checks are not a reasonable basis of comparison., considering all the samples of her handwriting, she has two distinct signatures. One that manifests on the checks and used practically only on the checks.

She rarely uses the middle initial in signing any other documents. Almost all other signatures are Stella Mann.

In respect to the argument of contemporaneousness, he said it is not of significance here because the individual is mature, she is not ill, she was not under any known severe strains at that time or psychotic conditions which would affect her ability to write. She has a college background and stable position.

Therefore, considering the time span of the documents involved, he did not consider that significant.

The smear in front of the S he pointed out comes clear best as a smear in the photograph but he did not consider it because it's a reddish brown material. It's found on the back part of the upper fold. It is a substance added to the fiber of the paper.

It is not eradicator and is of a different color of any of the pens used for any of the signatures on the paper. He believed it was some foreign substance that had somehow smudged there, that the illusion of an S paraphrases his testimony is largely the figament of one's imagination.

He, too ran through the details, using the defendant's exhibits, and found that the most comparable P-2 because it was the only full signature within that set.

The Court finds Ordway HIlton the more observant and knowledgable of those who testified. The Court finds P-la, Plf, comparisons unduly limited because the Court finds that plaintiff almost never uses her middle initial except on checks and lends crednece to the hypothesis that she utilizes two signatures.

One for checks and one for all other purposes.

The Court finds Stella Mann on J-1 comparable to her other signatures, including those written in P-4, the same week that J-1 was executed.

The Court finds J-1 no forgery. The Court finds Stella Mann did what she said she would do, give it back when asked because Izzy he needed it for his business. The Court finds that Izzy did not record it until January 28th, 1977 because then he had to deal with banks for a line of credit. He, in substance, kept this aspect of it that he didn't use it until he needed it for his business.

The Court finds that one reason she gave it back was that she did not pay Thirty-Three Five Hundred Dollars.

In the courtroom, she displayed a tough, aggressive attitude towards her counsel. She ran to counsel table with suggestions for periods of time. sat there prompting questions. From her demeanor and behavior, the Court finds that she would not have given J-1 back if she had paid Thirty-Three Thousand Five Hundred Dollars for the property. Her testimony as to demands to sell the house was equivocal, to say the least. Basically, they were statements of desire, none were in writing and few were oral. The Court finds that she would have demanded her money if she had paid it. She was not in a position to give away Thirty-Three Thousand Five Hundred Dollars.

The Court does not know what prompted the inquiry on October 4th, 1971, a Tuesday. She did not make any telephone call after she learned of the alleged forgery on Tuesday, until Sunday, October 9th, and then she called Joel Nagle. Unfortunately, the tape recording of the conversation for eighteen minutes with joel Nagle has been lost by erasure.

The tape of the Iacaponi call was not one of inquiry but one of a hunt for evidence. The questions were leading, the questions were loaded and the Court got the distinct impression that her version and statements on it had been prepared in advance, if not rehearsed before the call. Why was there a wait for five days after discovery of a forgery, why was there not some going to an attorney if this were so to seek redress?

Why look for a forged deed out of property in which she had an interest? That normally comes about by other means.

The Ill health of defendant about that time is a more plausible explanation that she wanted to make sure that the deed that she had received or had seen and had been left to Benjamin Weiss to be recorded had in fact been recorded. The Court agrees with the decision in the matter of Sylvestry cited by counsel for the plaintiff in the New York Court of Appeals.

The Court had earlier read Volume VII of Wigmore, Section 2026 on the use of expert opinion, but as the trier of the facts, the Court accepts and uses the opinions of experts.

According to the basis upon which they are give, its experience and the ability to observe that experts display and couples that with other evidence in the case to reach the conclusion and the other samples,. taking into account all the testimony of the experts including P-4, including her signature on the back of other checks and envelopes on letters addressed to her employers and elsewhere the Court finds there was no forgery.

The court agrees that the defendant cannot defeat his deed of P-8 to show a resulting trust, Downing v. Downing, 80N.J. Equity, 68 and Camden Trust v. Kraemer, 136 N.J. Equity, 261 at 265.

The Court disagrees that showing of the non-payment of the Thirty-Three Five is barred by the Parol Evidence Rule, Vol. IX of Wigmore, Evidence Section 2433. See alsoSmith Am Jur 2nd Trust, Consideration Section 630. 77 Am Jur 2nd Vendor Purchase Lien Section 431,et seq. 79N.J., Equity, 5501. 137 N.J. Equity , 416.

The court has considered defendant's use of the premises from October 14th, 1971 through January 23rd, 1974, the setting aside differences over the time when he commenced to use them. Plaintiff made no demand to occupy a portion of the premises or for possession of the premises, hence, defendant never ousted her,never refused her in.

The evidence is that any time she or her nephew wanted to use it, they did. Hence, there was no ouster. To some extent, she and her nephew used the premises whenever she wanted. Defendant paid all the expenses. The Court finds that by giving the deed, she waived any claim that she may have had if, indeed, she had any claim under the circumstances.

Thereafter, they were happy for three years, travel, expensive gifts, until this interlude interrupted their lives again. The Court, therefore, finds that the plaintiff has established no cause of action, but would suggest that counsel for the defendant draw an appropriate judgement, primarily to clarify the title question. Submit it to counsel on the other side. I'll return all the exhibits at this time.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the within is an accurate transcript of my stenographic notes taken at the above place and time,. to the best of my knowledge and belief.

_____

E. MICHELE HENLEY,C.S.R.

Dated:_____

NEWARK MUNICIPAL COURT

NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

August 8, 1979

IN THE MATTER OF:

STATE OF NEW JERSEYvs. JOEL J. NAGEL

Complaint No. 75374

STATE OF NEW JERSEY vs. ANTHONY IACAPONI

Complaint No. 75375

STATE OF NEW JERSEY vs.ISADORE SPIEGEL

Complaint No. 75376

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE CHESTER A. MORRISON, Magistrate

THE COURT: Mr. Teltser, I've given everybody an opportunity to speak, so I guess it's my time.

As I see it, I find probable cause as to all. Now, I have some reservations with respect to Mr. Nagel and I will state those reserrvations last, but as to Mr. Spiegel, there is no doubt in my mind, at least for the purpose of this hearing, it's Miss Mann's testimony that Mr. Spiegeldid have the deed. There is no question that at some point, Mr. Spiegel and Miss Mann were the record owners of title of that piece of property. There is no doubt in my mind at some point there was a deed and this is S-2, which transferred that property from Stella Mann to Mr. Spiegel, individually. Mr. Spiegel had in his possession this deed, as testified to by Miss Mann in the court before Judge Dwyer, in the Chancery Court.

All of those things being equal, I don't think this Court has to find anything else. He had it. He had the opportunity. She says there was a forgery. Now, if there was a forgery the question is who did it.

There is the probability that Mr. Spiegel knew about it when he did it. Unequivocally, that answer has to be yes. This lady knows Mr. Spiegel and Mr. Spiegel knows Miss Mann. It just simply seems to me there is no other -- there is no equivocation about it.

With respect to Mr. Iacaponi, there is no question in my mind that he did speak -- and I'm only speaking for the purpose of record now -- that he said to Miss Mann that the document was not legal and that he admitted also -- excuse me.

I have this the other way around in a sense. I mean as to Mr. Nagel Mr. Nagel is the one who admitted on the record that that was his signature, as I have it, in the Chancery Court. Now, whether or not he , in fact, knew of any particular forgery or not, one who witnesses a document, not only witnesses the document but witnesses the signature of those persons who are transferring and on the basis of that, there has to be, at least, if there was not a forgery but a fraud.

Now, inasmuch as the major or the prime problem at this point inasmuch as the charge is forgery, it seems competent to me to remain that way.

Now, with respect to Mr. Nagel, I would also send that to the Grand Jury probable cause having been found.

Now, Mr. Iacaponi, on the basis of the documents which I saw, whether he offered the document, whether Mr. Nagel offered the document or whether Mr. Spiegel offered the document, what I mean by that is offered it for recordation or offered it for some form of collateral of some other type, this is something that would be without special knowledge of Miss Mann so how could she be held accountable to present that? I do know this, that the deed was duly -- and I'm finding as a fact now -- the deed was duly recorded. It's her testimony, Miss Mann's testimony that it's not her signature,. If it were offered and Mr. Iacaponi stands as one of the witnesses to that signature, then on the basis of that I would also send this to the Grand Jury.

I would say this, however, if that is the only proof against Mr. Iacaponi, it would seem reasonable to me that there would be a verdict in favor of Mr. Iacaponi. I don't have to find that at this point. I only have to find whether or not the probability exists that the three people had reason to know that this was not Miss Mann's signature. On the basis of the testimony as I have heard it, I have drawn that conclusion and on that basis I will send all matters to the Grand Jury.

MISS: MANN: God bless you, your Honor.

MR. TELSTER: The evidence, I intend to take this, you Honor. The evidence S-1 and S-2 are in the Prosecutor's folder.I would like those taken to Court by the Court as part of record.

THE COURT: Mr. Prosecutor, will you have copies of both of these documents made so they can --

MR. TELSTER: Your Honor, I'd like the originals that have been marked placed with the Court, your Honor, so we may have the evidence on record.

THE COURT: No problem.

MR. TELSTER: For the Court record

THE COURT: Please, ma'am. Mr. Berman, make copies of those for your file and give me the two documents that were marked. Okay?

MR. BERMAN: Your Honor, I will furnish them with a copy. I want the Court to obtain the copies of the two documents which were marked. I want you to make copies for your file.

MR. BERMAN: For my file.?

THE COURT: Yes. I want the originals which were marked. All right?

MR. BERMAN: Make copies so she'll have them, too? You want it for your own file.

THE COURT: No, I want it so there will be a complete record of everything that's been on this record which I will assume will be transcribed together with the documents.

MR. BERMAN: In other words, the two deeds you want copies of from me.

THE COURT: Yes, I want the original- of the two pieces of paper which we marked as evidence.

THE COURT: No, I want it so there will be a complete of everything that's been on this record which I will assume will be transcribed together with the documents.

MR. BERMAN: In other words, the two deeds you want copies of from me.

THE COURT: Yes, I want the originals of the two pieces of paper which we marked as evidence.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, **NANCY J. GILMARTIN,** A CEERTIFIED shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes taken at the time and place aforementioned.

NANCY J. GILMARTIN,CRS.

STELLA MANN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ISADORE SPIEGEL

defendant - Respondent

Argued May 10,1983

Decided June 10, 1983

Before Judges Michels, Pressler and Trautwein. On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division, Essex County.

Stella Mann, appellant, argued the cause for respondent.

PER CURLAM

Plaintiff stella Mann appeals (1) from a judgement of the Chancery Division entered in favor of defendant Isadore Spiegel declaring that she had no estate of interest in or encumbrance or lien upon the lands and premises designated 6-8 Watchung Road , Short Hills, New Jersey,

and that the title to said lands and premises is in defendant and (2) from an order of the trial court denying her motions for a judgement notwithstanding the verdict or, alternatively a new trial on grounds of (A) her contention that the verdict was contrary to the weight of the evidence, (B) newly discovered evidence, and (C) an alleged confflict of interest between her former attorneys, Sills,Beck, Cummis,Radin & Tischman, and defendant's attorney, Harold R. Telster.

We are seatisfied from our study of the voluminous record and the arguments presented that the judgement of the trial court is based on findings of fact which are adegquately supported by the evidence that the denial of the motion for a new trial did not constiture a manifest denial of justice and that all issues of law raised are clearly without merit.

R 2:1103(e) (1) (A),(C) and (E). Contrary to plaintiff's claim there is substantial credible evidence on the record as a whole to reasonably warrant the trial court's finding and conclusion that the deed dated January 23, 1974, which conveyed plaintiff's one-half interest in the lands and premises designated 6-8 Watchung Road Short Hills,New Jersey, to defendant, was not a forgery, and we discern no sound reason or justification for disturbing them.Leimgruber v. Claridge Associates, Ltd., 73N.J.,450,455-456(1977); Rova Farms Resort v. Investors Ins. Co. 65N.J., 474,483-484(1974); State v. Johnson, 42 N.J., 146,163(1964).

Accordingly, this judgement and order under review are affirmed substantially for the reasons expressed by Judge Dwyer in his oral opinions of April 25, 1979 and August 17, 1979 (as reconstructed on May 19, 1981), respectively.

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

C-268 SEPTEMBER TERM

1984

21,563

STELLA MANN,

Plaintiff-Petitioner,

vs.

ISADORE SPIEGEL,

Defendant- Respondent.

To the Appellate Divisioin, Superior Court:

A petition for certification of the judgement in A-444-79T2 having been submitted to this court, and the Court having considered the same;

It is ORDERED that the petition for certification is denied with costs,.

WITNESS, The Honorable Robert L., Clifford, Presiding Justice, at Trenton, this 7th day of November,1984.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1984

No. _____

STELLA E. MANN,

PETITIONER, PLAINTIFF

V.

ISADORE SPIEGEL

RESPONDENT. DEFENDANT

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF NEW JERSEY)
)
COUNTY OF ESSEX) .SS.:

Stella E. Mann, after being duly sworn, deposes and says that a PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI has been mailed by certified mail to the office of Harold R. Teltser Esq. and a copy to the Court below.

_____

Sworn and Subscribed before me

this _____ day of April 1985.